

**far
east**

Reporter

35¢

EDUCATION

**A CRITIQUE
FROM CHINA**

**Pedagogical Theory:
Bourgeois or
Socialist?**



SOME FAR EAST REPORTER ISSUES

Issues on China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

Report on the Cultural Revolution

By Lin Piao 1969 50¢

China's On-Going Cultural Revolution 35¢

By Maud Russell

The Cultural Revolution in A Commune Village 25¢

By Elsie Fairfax Cholmeley

China's Economic Health and the G P C R 40¢

By Maud Russell

The Seizure of Power in China's Socialist 35¢

Society By Israel Epstein

China's Genuine Democracy: Among the Communes

of Mao Tien By Rewi Alley

Mass Democracy In

China By Israel Epstein 30¢

Some Background on the Great Proletarian 50¢

Cultural Revolution By Maud Russell

The Making of New Man

By Tuan Ping-li 30¢

The Influence of The Thought of Mao Tse-tung 25¢

By Rewi Alley

Issues on Medicine in China

Traditional Medicine in Communist China: Science,

Communism & Cultural Nationalism 50¢

By Ralph C Croizier

An Observation on Acupuncture in China 40¢

By Felix Mann

Acupuncture: The Scientific Evidence 25¢

By Dr Han Su-yin

Oriental Renaissance in Education & Medicine 25¢

By Dr Wilder Penfield

Art & Science in China (Two articles on 50¢

Acupuncture

Medicine & Public Health in China (from Amer 25¢

Ass'n for the Advancement of Science)

EDUCATION
A CRITIQUE FROM CHINA
PEDAGOGICAL THEORY: BOURGEOIS OR SOCIALIST?

Far East Reporter Introduction
To "Who Transforms Whom?"

In April and May, 1970, following President Nixon's decision to invade Cambodia, 12 young people in Kent, Augusta and Jackson were killed. In May eight members of the White House staff (all under the age of 30) were sent by the President on a tour of about thirty college campuses. Reports in Newsweek, The Los Angeles Times, The New York Times and the Washington Evening Star said that these staff members had been stunned by the depth of student hostility and the rapid erosion of respect for the Government. They reported that nonpolitical sons and daughters of the middle class were becoming increasingly suspicious of the Administration's policies.

The contrast between contemporary US youth and the "silent generation" of students of the 1950's is obvious. There is a quality in their protests that goes deeper than mere changes in their hair and clothing styles. They are involved in draft resistance, in the destruction of ROTC buildings and the banning of military and industrial recruiting on campuses. Even on army bases there is resistance to the war. There is a proliferation of GI underground papers. Black Panthers, Puerto Rican Young Lords and Chicanos are organizing in the ghettos. Young nuns, priests and ex-Peace Corps members are invading draft board offices. Universities such as Princeton, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Stanford and Cornell are officially accepting the "Princeton Plan" for an election recess this fall to enable students to do election campaign work. (NYT 6/9/70) And, significantly, there is a growing alliance between students and trade unionists around the issues of labor, civil rights and opposition to the war.

Radicals and Ideology

Growing numbers of young people are thus expressing the need for radical changes in the system that rules

the United States - a system that is oppressive and restrictive to masses of people both at home and abroad. They believe the words of a Kent student that "this country is becoming what people in Europe came here to escape." (NYT 5/11/70)

It must be noted that, except for a small minority, the options open to these young people are currently greatly limited by the absence of a clearly oriented Marxist-Leninist political movement with a mass base, both of which are essential to link the day-to-day struggle with a long-range program. It is just this that distinguishes the movement of American youth from that of the Chinese youth.

The youth of China, in their ongoing Cultural Revolution, are in the process of sharp and deep examination of their educational system - rejecting the bourgeois pedagogy which lingered on even after the establishment of their new society in 1949. They are seeing how this bourgeois ideology provided a base for elitism, favoritism, bureaucracy and control by a privileged and exploiting minority. Their current examination of their educational system and societal development is based on the Marxist-Leninist approach, on the theory and principles of dialectical materialism, on the Thought of Mao Tsetung. Because of this approach they are able to understand the essence of their society, to see its totality and interconnections, and to define their role with greater accuracy and with better prospects for their socialist society.

The Impact of USSR Pedagogy on China's Education

Pre-1949 education in China was largely inherited from the bourgeois West; post-1949 education added certain elements from socialist USSR. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of 1966-1968 was largely concerned with an attack on this revisionist kind of education, which was seen as one of the factors that could lead China off the socialist path.

FAR EAST REPORTER herein presents a critique of the impact of Soviet pedagogy on the educational system of China. This critique, "WHO TRANSFORMS WHOM?", is illustrative of the process of examination of education now going on in China in that it is not written by a government or high-level Party group, but is the product of a collective evaluation by the Revolutionary Mass Criticism Writing Group in Shanghai.

This Mass Criticism Writing Group challenges the theoretical premises of Soviet pedagogy and calls for their elimination from educational practices in China. It examines the use that Chinese revisionists made of the pedagogical theories of A I Kairov, who for many years has been President of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR (the largest republic in the USSR). His presentations at conferences of teaching personnel are published in leading journals and translated abroad in the United States in "Soviet Education".

In 1961 Kairov hailed Khrushchev's speeches "with great attention, excitement and joy" and credited the then Premier with establishing the basis on which "urgent problems of the communist upbringing of the growing generation" could be solved. But in 1965, at a meeting of the Academy, he acknowledged that "the Academy is primarily responsible for the fact that pedagogical science has not been in step with the development of the national economy....it is not solving our new problems, not keeping ahead of practice, and not promoting practical work to move forward." What are Kairov's proposals? He proposed new research, an end to narrow specialization, plus a host of practical tasks, but not a word about the underlying philosophy, the groundwork for the whole educational process.

It was this Kairov brand of pedagogy that China's revisionists were putting into practice in the schools and which is now being popularly examined and criticized.

The Chinese emphasize, first and foremost, the theory of education, an examination of its class essence - whom it serves and by whom it is controlled.

Revisionist Education

Kairov's avoidance of any overt reference to a theoretical basis for shortcomings in Soviet society is hardly accidental. The failure to correctly indoctrinate and train teaching personnel (and thereby the millions of students whom they reach) is part and parcel of the revisionist, idealist line. This the Chinese, by their examination of the fruits of education since 1949, understand. The fruits of a revisionist line in education (widespread in the USSR and incipient in China) are: preoccupation with personal material accumulation and striving for academic degrees and titles, avoiding factory assignments, rejection of work in the countryside or in virgin lands, an influx to the excitement of city life, introduction of bourgeois standards of entertainment, unwillingness to work, and sponging on parents and society.

Under the influence of Kairov's Pedagogy the revisionist educators in China were looking down on students from the countryside and from the working class, giving them scant help and no encouragement, favoring students from the former privileged strata, urging them to get education for jobs, prestige, power, position and wealth. This kind of education leads toward an elite superstructure - a highly paid, privileged, and self-perpetuating strata - toward a non-socialist society.

China's Socialist Educational Theory and Practice

China's educational practice today follows Mao's advice to "shorten the length of schooling, revolutionize education, put proletarian politics in command." "Shorten schooling" - not shorten education!

Millions of students migrate to the countryside - not with the bourgeois idea of having some of their education rub off on the peasants, but to be educated by working with the rural population. They are educated to see themselves as workers. China is a socialist country where workers, not a bourgeois elite, rule the country. This migration is a basic part of the process of further understanding and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is genuine education - not education for just a section of the people labelled

"students" - but for everyone: "every intellectual a worker, and every worker an intellectual." Intellectuals are being remolded by "going to the masses and learning from them." Especially noteworthy since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, is the system of workers' responsibility for school management, involving their supervision of curriculum and training of teachers and students.

American and Soviet Educational Policy - The Same Path

In the USSR Kairov writes that education is the "passing on of experience and knowledge to a new generation by the older generation" whose "primary task is to give the students profound, accurate and common knowledge on the development of nature, society and human thought."

And in the United States, Eli Ginzberg, Director of the Conservation of Human Resources Project at Columbia University, declares: "Education....is the means by which society transmits from one generation to the next, the values, knowledge and skills which alone can secure its survival. The attitudes a society has toward problems of development and education are as important as - and perhaps even more important than - the institutions that have specific responsibility for developing and educating the young." When "attitudes of society" is translated as its "philosophy" one can readily see how the United States ruling class uses a "two-track system" of education to "insure its survival."

The educational philosophy of both the US and the USSR provide, on the one hand, a well-trained, self-perpetuating, privileged elite and, on the other hand, a growing reservoir of workers (millions living on or below the poverty line) who serve the interests of a ruling elite.

Many books have appeared in recent years, deploring, in varying degrees, the state of education in the United States. Some are more forthright in pinpointing what is wrong. Dr Kenneth B Clark, the noted Black psychologist and member of the New York Board of Regents writes, "Our public school system has rejected its role

of facilitating social mobility and has become in fact an instrument of social and economic class distinction in American society" (in his introduction to "Education and Income: Inequalities in Our Public School" by Patricia C Sexton). Dr Sexton acknowledges the class delineations in American schools, but when the key question of how to remedy the educational problem arises, her solution reduces to a catalogue of tools: class size reduction, more money, experiments, rewards, discard IQ tests, etc.

Neither Dr Clark nor Dr Sexton calls for a basic change in the philosophy that considers poor children "uneducable" and "culturally deprived," that divides 6-year-olds into "achievers" and "non-achievers", and that even devises tests for early identification of criminal tendencies in infants! This is "two-track" education, where poor children receive inferior education as compared with the well-to-do - a maintaining of segregation even in "integrated" schools.

A decade ago, James Conant, in "Slums and Suburbs" (1961), predicted "social dynamite" unless inferior schools, discrimination and unemployment were remedied. But despite these studies and warnings, the present US educational system is incapable of even these minimal changes within the bourgeois framework. There are occasional gestures "maximum feasible participation," "community control," and "Black Study Programs." But these are all token, semantically inspired, "compensatory" programs, as are "Higher Horizons," "Seek," etc - illusory concessions designed to control or detour those who question the class essence of American education and of the society it serves.

Overheard in a Ghetto School

These reflections on school developments in the United States, the Soviet Union and China are at best sketchy. Perhaps the following incident, witnessed by the writer, will give food for thought:

In the fall of 1968, outside a New York City public school where working class parents had just "liberated" a school during the city-wide United Federation of Teachers strike over a dispute in Ocean Hill-Brownsville, a middle-aged Black father watched, some neighbors and children by his side. As the signal came for the children to enter, he hesitated. He turned to another parent and said: "Should we fight to go back into these schools? Maybe we should close 'em up like the Chinese and make 'em over."



Who Transforms Whom?

A comment on Kairov's "Pedagogy"

Drawn up under Chairman Mao's personal guidance, the Decisions of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution pointed out: "In the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution a most important task is to transform the old educational system and the old principles and methods of teaching." At present, we must press ahead with redoubled efforts to accomplish what Chairman Mao pointed out as "a most important task."

An important experience gained in the course of the proletarian educational revolution is that we must persist in using Mao Tsetung Thought to carry out revolutionary mass criticism and eliminate the poisonous influence of the renegade hidden traitor and scab Liu Shao-chi's counter-revolutionary revisionist line in education.

The "theoretical" basis of Liu Shao-chi's counter-revolutionary revisionist line in education is PEDAGOGY, (1) edited by the Soviet revisionist "authority" on education - Kairov. As explained in the first chapter of the 1956 edition PEDAGOGY entirely serves the purpose of fulfilling "the new tasks in education put forward by the 20th Congress" of the Soviet revisionist party, that is, the "tasks" of restoring capitalism.

Shortly after the socialist revolution began in China Liu Shao-chi and his agents on the cultural and educational front - Lu Ting-yi and his bunch - brought in Kairov's PEDAGOGY and designated it as teaching material for teachers' colleges throughout the country. They did this to oppose Chairman Mao's proletarian line in education. In 1957 they let Kairov visit Peking, Shanghai and many other places where he spread his poisonous influence. Liu Shao-chi personally received him and had a "warm and hearty" talk with him. When the revolutionary teachers and students, guided by Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, launched a high tide in educational revolution in 1958 and severely censured Kairov's PEDAGOGY, Lu Ting-yi

tried to snuff out the vigorous educational revolution, rushing forth in defence and howling that Kairov's PEDAGOGY "is socialist."

In expounding the law of class struggle in the socialist period, Chairman Mao pointed out: "The Proletariat seeks to transform the world according to its own world outlook, and so does the bourgeoisie. In this respect, the question of which will win out, socialism or capitalism, is still not really settled." Who transforms whom? Should we use Chairman Mao's proletarian thinking on education to transform the old bourgeois schools, or should we let Kairov's PEDAGOGY carry the day in our schools? This is a serious struggle on the educational front between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. In order to deepen the educational revolution, it is therefore necessary to use Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to analyze and criticize Kairov's PEDAGOGY.

Two Diametrically Opposed Views on Education

What is education?

In reply to this question, the first chapter of Kairov's PEDAGOGY says: "Education is purely a human phenomenon." (2) This definition completely denies a most fundamental fact: In class society, education is a phenomenon of class struggle. It is by no means true that "a man should receive a proper education in order to be a man." (3) Every class wants education to be given because it wants to maintain its rule. Education develops out of the need of class struggle, not out of an abstract human need. Every class educates and transforms the younger generation in accordance with its own world outlook and political line, training its own successors and thereby achieving the purpose of consolidating its own rule. After seizing political power, the proletarian must turn education, which is an instrument for bourgeois rule, into an instrument for demolishing this rule and for completely eliminating the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes. The proletariat must make education an important position where "the proletariat must exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in the realm of the superstructure, including the various spheres of culture." For the dictatorship of the proletariat to be consolidated and the socialist revolution and socialist construction carried through to the end, proletarian education must train working people with socialist consciousness and culture from among the workers,

poor and lower-middle peasants and fighters in the Liberation Army. We will never allow any one to deny this clear-cut class character of proletarian education on any pretext whatsoever.

But Kairov, lauded to the skies by Lu Ting-yi as a "socialist" educator, gave this definition when he spoke of the essence of education. Education, he said, is the "passing on of experience and knowledge to a new generation" by the "older generation";(4) in a socialist school, therefore, "the primary task is to give the students profound, accurate and common knowledge on the development of nature, society and human thought."(5)

Taking this as his cue, Lu Ting-yi parroted: "This thing called education is quite clear; it means passing on knowledge to others and learning knowledge from others. This is what education means."

Is that really "what education means"?

Knowledge and the passing on of knowledge are not supra-class or supra-politics; nor is it true that "all children are equal"(6) in this respect as Kairov claimed.

Knowledge and culture are a reflection of social being. Chairman Mao has taught us: "Ever since class society came into being the world has had only two kinds of knowledge, knowledge of the struggle for production and knowledge of the class struggle." Since education is an instrument of class struggle and class dictatorship, all knowledge that comes from it is bound to be thoroughly permeated with a class character. In the schools the slave-owners set up for their own children, the students were taught to use living slaves as "targets" for practice in shooting and killing. This is passing on one kind of "knowledge" that is, the slave-owners' "knowledge." Hitler growled that "we will train" fascists "before whom the world will tremble." This is also passing on one kind of "knowledge." Social-imperialism has recently snarled that it will train a type of "young cadre" who can "make quick decisions equal to the occasion" and carry out tasks of aggression "without any reservation." This is also passing on one kind of "knowledge," that is, social-imperialist "knowledge." Replete with lengthy descriptions of tsarist Russia's "explorers and travellers." Kairov's PEDAGOGY "fascinatingly" "encourages the development of the spirit

of adventure among the students." (7) Is it not clear what kind of "knowledge" Kairov was passing on? As Lenin had pointed out: "It was the declared aim of the old type of school to produce men with an all-around education, to teach the sciences in general. We know that this was utterly false." "Every word (the old school gave) was falsified in the interests of the bourgeoisie." (Collected Works, Lenin, Chinese ed. Vol 31 p 252)

As regards the "passing on of knowledge" is it possible that "all children are equal"? This Lassalleian opportunist view of "a national education with every one enjoying equality" was thoroughly criticized by Marx long ago. Since the beginning of classes, all exploiting classes in a ruling position have held a tight grip on the monopoly of knowledge, making it absolutely impossible for the powerless exploited classes to receive an education. In ancient India, a country in the East under the slave system, a law stipulated an immediate death sentence for anyone allowing the Shudra class, which was considered to be lowly, to obtain any knowledge. Confucius, who represented the interests of ancient China's declining slave-owners and aristocracy, did his utmost to advocate the keeping the people in complete ignorance. He said that "the people can be made to follow a course but they cannot be made to understand it." Such a policy was later followed by the feudal landlord class for more than 2000 years. Bourgeois education which emerged with the capitalist relations of production is entirely subordinate to the law of profit which reflects the bourgeoisie's reactionary nature. The so-called "double track system" of education which the bourgeoisie pushes is completely pervaded with its class character of enslavement and exploitation. All those who are children of the bourgeoisie will be given the "knowledge" of exploiting and oppressing the working people, and be trained to be the future rulers. But all those who are children of the working people will be kept out of the schools or, as Lenin said, be trained into "useful servants of the bourgeoisie" able to "create profits for it without disturbing its peace and leisure." (In Lenin, Collected Works, Chinese ed Vol 31 p 252)

It is therefore quite clear that any talk denying the class character of education is nothing but sheer political deception. Saturated with the class character of the bourgeoisie, Kairov's PEDAGOGY is in fact an attack by

the bourgeoisie on the proletariat. It was this same Kairov who, while boasting of the "guiding principle of his PEDAGOGY in 1957, said: "The schools have now two tasks: to train students who will study in institutes of higher learning and to train students who will participate in labour and production." (8) The "two tasks" Kairov mentioned are the "two kinds of educational systems" advocated by Liu Shao-chi; they are also identical with the so-called competition in climbing the "pyramid," as initiated by Lu Ting-yi: a few will get to the top and become new bourgeois elements, while the majority will be kept at the bottom, that is to say, they will have to engage in "labour and production," when capitalism is restored. Thus we have quite a variety of terminology - from Kairov's "equality in education" to his "two tasks" of education, and from Liu Shao-chi's "two kinds of educational systems" to Lu Ting-yi's competition in climbing the "pyramid." Though they go by different names, their essence is the same, namely, to achieve the counter-revolutionary purpose of transforming the proletariat according to the bourgeois world outlook and restoring capitalism.

Kairov openly declared: The educational thoughts of the 17th century Czechoslovak bourgeois educator Comenius and the 19th century Russian bourgeois educator Ushinsky all were "opposed to the ruling principles of the social systems" of their time and therefor, they constituted "the most valuable experience in education" (9) which we must now inherit in their entirety.

Hence bourgeois educational thoughts, which have grown from the economic base of capitalism, are not only "opposed" to the capitalist social system but are flaunted as "the most valuable experience in education" for the socialist educational system! This fully shows that Kairov's stock in trade was, in essence, the same as the traditional bourgeois education. What such education "opposes" is not the capitalist system, but the socialist system. "There is no construction without destruction no flowing without damming, and no motion without rest." From Kairov, a teacher by negative example, we have learnt that the proletariat must thoroughly criticize the bourgeoisie's educational system and educational theories and thoughts in order to establish its own educational system. "Education must serve proletarian politics and be combined with productive labour." "Our educational policy must en-

able everyone who receives an education to develop morally, intellectually and physically and become a worker with both social consciousness and culture." On these fundamental questions, proletarian education must unequivocally draw a clear line of demarcation with respect to the educational thoughts of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes.

Two Diametrically Opposed Theories of Knowledge

On the basis of his already mentioned reactionary concept of education, Kairov, without exception, collected Comenius' teaching principles, Ushinsky's theory on moral education and even the "four-division teaching method" of the German reactionary educator Herbart. After some tinkering, he patched together his huge teaching "system," which included "five teaching principles," "six links in the classroom," "a five-grade marking system" as well as a host of "principles," "structures," "outlines," "regulations," "means" and "methods." It was so typical of scholasticism that Lu Ting-yi and his gang greeted it with accolades, talked about how "scientific" it was, and ordered that teachers all over the country must carry it out most precisely.

Is it really so "scientific"? Certainly not. Actually, it is an anti-scientific and bogus science.

Chairman Mao has taught us: "All work in the schools is for transforming the ideology of the students."

The process of teaching is one of knowing, and all of man's knowledge is stamped with the brand of a class. Therefore, this process is one in which two ideologies struggle with each other, proletarian ideology overcomes non-proletarian ideology, and the students' proletarian world outlook is gradually fostered in the living study and application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and in the three great revolutionary practices - - class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment.

The correct realization of the teaching process must be guided by a correct theory of knowledge. The proletariat has the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge and the bourgeoisie has the idealist metaphysical theory of knowledge. From what theory of knowledge did Kairov

proceed to arrive at his mass of "principles" and "methods"?

After quoting a passage of Lenin's instruction on the theory of knowledge, Kairov openly stated that "teaching is not and cannot be a process identical with the scientific process of knowledge." (10) This is like saying that the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge is null and void in the teaching process.

Having negated the Marxist theory of knowledge in one stroke, Kairov advanced his own "theory of knowledge": As long as the students "comprehend the already known." (11) and the "available knowledge" (13) that "man has accumulated over the centuries," (12) everything will be all right, because all this knowledge "belongs to scientifically solid and reliable wealth" (14) and is absolute truth which can never be changed to the slightest degree.

In talking about "accumulated" and "available" plus "solid and reliable," Kairov really can be said to be a "knowledge capitalist"! However, this "knowledge capitalist" doesn't know a thing about the historical-materialist knowledge on class struggle.

The reactionary world outlook of the exploiting classes determines that the "knowledge" they have "accumulated" is full of mistakes which distort objective reality. Take history for example. As written by the exploiting classes, history has been turned upside down: The peasants in the uprisings which pushed history forward in feudal society were slandered as "brigands" and "bandits"; on the other hand, emperors, kings, generals and ministers were described as the masters of history and their "policy of concessions" were said to have promoted the advance of history. Unless this reactionary point of view is criticized, it is impossible to get any "available" and scientific knowledge of history. How can we regard all of these reactionary and fallacious things the landlord class and the bourgeoisie have talked about "over the centuries" as "available" and "solid and reliable wealth" we can accept? Isn't this an open plea for students to be submissive; "accept" all kinds of spiritual poison? Isn't this training bourgeois slaves who resist all revolutionary truths? Isn't this a typical theory for staging a cultural restoration?

Chairman Mao has taught us: "In the absolute and general process of development of the universe, the development of each particular process is relative, and that hence, in the endless flow of absolute truth, man's knowledge of a particular process at any given stage of development is only relative truth, The sum total of innumerable relative truths constitutes absolute truth." Even those parts of the "knowledge" that contain certain amounts of relative truth must also be examined, remoulded and developed in the light of today's revolutionary practice of the proletariat and should not be regarded as something forever unchangeable. To more rapidly master the latest knowledge in the field of natural science, that is, the newly discovered relative truth at a new stage of development, it is sometimes unnecessary to go back to its development "over the centuries." From the start, we can talk about the latest discoveries and latest creations of the working class. It should be pointed out that Kairov's "solid and reliable wealth" poison was one of the reasons for the repetition and unnecessary complexity of textbooks in the past.

Kairov solidified knowledge not merely out of ignorance, but because of his reactionary bourgeois nature. Since the bourgeoisie have long since been "sinking fast, like the sun setting beyond the western hills," they dare not in the least face the fiery struggle of the proletariat and other revolutionary people and look at the revolutionary situation in which class struggle, like the struggle for production and scientific experiment advance at a fast rate. They can only turn their backs on the present and face the past, calling all the reactionary and rotten traditional ideologies of the slave-owner class, landlord class and bourgeoisie "solid and reliable knowledge." They won't allow people to wage revolution against this knowledge, criticize it and develop it. In doing so they have tried in vain to hold back the rapid spread of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought all over the globe. Didn't Lu Ting-yi shout that "many universities are engaged in transforming education, and my attitude is to wait and see"?

Their real purpose in "solidifying" knowledge is to "consolidate" the bourgeoisie's ruling position, "consolidate" their right to carry out unlimited exploitation of the working people so they can live on the latter's sweat and blood, and, in other words, "consolidate" their "wealth."

The law of the Marxist theory of knowledge is: "Practice, knowledge, again practice, and again knowledge" and "The standpoint of practice is the primary and basic standpoint in the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge." But Kairov declared that he had found a "short cut," that is, from the books of the teachers to those of the students. In his own words, what "decides the quality of the students' knowledge" is "class-room teaching" (15) and "the sources of knowledge are concrete things themselves as well as the description of matter, phenomenon, processes and events, printed matter (first and foremost textbooks) and the teachers' language." (16)

The small quantity of "printed matter" in the classes was limited to Kairov's tiny orbit of "five principles" and "six links." The maximum it could do was to cram into the students' minds all the "classical" textbooks and teaching materials that had been compiled by the bourgeoisie. Let's look at the textbooks and teaching materials which Lu Ting-yi and his gang turned out in accordance with the requirements of Kairov's PEDAGOGY. Anti-Marxist in their world outlook and their political content serving the needs of the bourgeoisie, they were completely cut off from the needs of the prevailing socialist revolution and construction. Their arrangements for teaching were filled with metaphysics. Courses were tremendously complicated and isolated from each other, and the lively objective world was cut to pieces. Enclosed all-year-round in the Kairov-designated classroom, which was like a hermetic can, the students were forced to gulp down, without digestion, stuff of the 18th and 19th century. For 16 or 17 years, they were unable to see rice, sorghum, and other kinds of grain, or how the workers work, how the peasants farm and how commodities are exchanged. Didn't this deliberately turn them into imbeciles?

It must be pointed out that we do not exclude students getting indirect knowledge in the classroom and from books. Teaching consists partly of imparting indirect knowledge. Precisely as Chairman Mao pointed out: "All genuine knowledge originates in direct experience. But one cannot have direct experience of everything; as a matter of fact, most of our knowledge comes from indirect experience - for example, all knowledge from past times and foreign lands." For students to really grasp it, indirect knowledge must also be combined with revolutionary practice. Only thus can it be transformed into "gen-

uine knowledge." In "making the past serve the present and foreign things serve China" and "weeding through the old to bring forth the new," the key is in the latter and serving today's revolutionary needs. Chairman Mao has taught us: "There are many things which cannot be learned from books alone; one must learn from those engaged in production, from the workers, from the peasants." This means students should get out of the school into the midst of actual struggle and make the workers, peasants and soldiers their teachers. "While their main task is to study they should also learn other things, that is to say, they should not only learn book knowledge, they should also learn industrial production, agricultural production and military affairs. They should also criticize and repudiate the bourgeoisie." Colleges of science and engineering should set up factories, while colleges of arts should consider the whole society their factory.

People may ask: Should children also learn according to this law? Don't they learn to distinguish between "good people" and "bad people" from picture books? Children also first learn to know individual and concrete things and then form a concept about a certain thing. Cattle are a broad concept, while the ox and the buffalo are narrow concepts. The ox a child sees is a concrete thing. Children below school age make society their school and imitate grown-ups in working and fighting. In this way they get a real-life education. But their perception was obstructed under the control of the revisionist line in education and this must also be reformed.

Kairov's anti-Marxist theory of knowledge directly upheld the domination of schools by the handful of bourgeois reactionary educational "authorities" and bourgeois intellectuals. To facilitate a capitalist restoration, it also tried to turn the younger generation into bourgeois elements who fear revolution and the masses and resist socialist things. Because of this, he went one step further in declaring:

"Every sentence and every instruction of the teacher has the nature of law"; (17) "all scientifically disputable and unconfirmed things should be excluded from courses." (18)

Whose "law" is this? If this "law" is adhered to, all students become slaves of bourgeois education and their

minds have only one function - endless memoriation and recitation. Revolutionary students must unite with the revolutionary teachers in overthrowing this kind of "teachers' dignity" advocated by the landlords and the bourgeoisie and in opposing dealing with students by methods used in dealing with the enemy. Both should also completely discredit the so-called "education of love" and must not let anyone poison students with the bourgeois theory of human nature.

Revolutionary educational work is glorious and so is the labour of the revolutionary teachers. The view that "it's tough luck to be a teacher" is wrong. Promoted by the proletarian revolution in education, completely new relations between teachers and students are taking shape in many of our schools. They are revolutionary comrades and comrades-in-arms and their relations are not those between the rulers and the ruled. The teachers should love the students, help them, use Mao Tsetung Thought to raise their political consciousness, bring their initiative, enthusiasm and creativeness into full play, and train them to have the ability to analyze and solve problems. The students should respect the teachers, firmly abide by revolutionary discipline and revolutionary order, study hard for the revolution in a lively way and be filled with proletarian revolutionary spirit.

Truth has a class character. There have never been truths commonly regarded as "indisputable" by all classes in the field of social science. "The socialist system will eventually replace the capitalist system." Can this objective truth which is regarded by the proletariat and the revolutionary people as indisputable be accepted likewise by the bourgeoisie? Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought develops in the course of struggle and can be learnt only in struggle. To oppose the revolutionary "contention" in the schools is to oppose the proletarian revolutionary spirit and to oppose using Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to criticize and occupy those positions controlled by the bourgeoisie. Therefore, Kairov's real aim is solely to allow the unchecked spread of bourgeois poisonous weeds, but not tolerate the existence of the proletarian truth. "It is one of our basic tasks to contrapose our own truth to bourgeois "truth" and win its recognition." (Lenin, Collected Works, Chinese ed. Vol 31 page 330) All revolutionary students and teachers should use Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to occupy all positions, and

strive to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and realize the great proletarian truth of "the abolition of the system of exploitation of man by man over the whole globe, upon which all mankind will be emancipated"!

Bourgeois "Self" is the Nucleus

Wasn't it Liu Shao-chi who concocted the notorious theory of "merging private and public interests"? This is the same as Kairov's contraption, the theory of the "transformation of the public interest into private" which alleges: "The public interest when it is correctly understood is also my personal interest." (19) The wording is different, but the aim is the same: to "transform" the public interest into private, to "transform" socialism into capitalism. The entire set of theory and practice in Kairov's PEDAGOGY proceeds from this theory of the "transformation of the public interest into private." While peddling Kairov's PEDAGOGY, Lu Ting-yi and company also used this crooked thesis as their bait.

Kairov stated in particular that among the entire mass of principles he concocted there was one main principle which "can be instituted in every stage and every link of process," that is, "the principle of the students' consciousness and initiative." (20) What kind of "consciousness and initiative" is this? How to stimulate this kind of student "consciousness and initiative"? Kairov's answer: "Getting marks in school is the impulsive factor in the students' life" and "a stimulus in learning." (21) How can such "impulsion" and "stimulus" be consolidated? Only when "famous people in the scientific and art fields or outstanding historical personages" become the students' ideal" will students find their intellectual support in these images." (22)

Here lies the real aim. The so-called "consciousness and initiative" is nothing but a bait to make students strive in line with the "style" of the representatives of the bourgeoisie and the landlord class!

Of course it is necessary for the proletariat to master scientific knowledge Lenin stated: "The working people are thirsting for knowledge because they need it to win." (Lenin, Collected Works, Ch ed Vol 23 p70) The pro-

letariat knows that the victory Lenin meant, which includes becoming the real masters of knowledge, relies on the powerful dictatorship of the proletariat above all. Therefore, just as Chairman Mao has pointed out: "Youth should **attach primary importance to a firm and correct political orientation.**" We study for the sake of the revolution, the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. In feverishly advocating that the students should regard their knowledge as their "wealth" Kairov wanted to turn knowledge into personal capital for gaining fame and fortune. He wanted those with knowledge to be arrogant and sell their knowledge at a good price. How many young people have been poisoned by the feudal class trash which says: "I learn every craft in order to sell them to the imperial and royal families," or to the bourgeois trash that says: "When I have learnt mathematics, physics and chemistry, I wouldn't have to worry about a job anywhere in the world!"

In this process of converting knowledge into private property, can the students form "sublime"(23)"world outlook and morality"(24) as described by Kairov? It is sheer nonsense! Socrates, the Greek slave-owners' educator, advocated the fallacy "knowledge is morality" 2,300 years before Kairov. Later, on bourgeois philosophers advocated that "knowledge is strength." But there is no "world outlook and morality" or "strength" in the world which stands above classes. What class' "world outlook" and "morality" did Kairov want the students to form? What class' reserve "strength" did he want to build up? Let us look at the process of formation he designed, the so-called "straight line" system of education: As soon as a student has entered school, his aim is to make his way up. By finishing primary school he looks forward to being admitted to middle school, by finishing middle school to be admitted to college, and by finishing college, to get an associate doctorate or doctorate degree by studying in a research institute. While a few people gain the laurels of an associate-doctor or doctor and are thus qualified to enter the "paradise" of the bourgeois privileged stratum, most people finish their primary or middle school education and become workers or peasants only to become exploited and oppressed by the bourgeoisie. Look at the highest criterion he set, the so-called "internal cultivation" - "external cultivation" - "all-round development." (25) That is from "internal cultivation" fostered to gain "social status"(26)

and "personal fulfillment"(29) to "external cultivation" of "clothing," "hair style" and "proper manners," (28) the students are to "develop in an all-round way" into the so-called "strength" imbued with bourgeois "morality" and into hypocrites, politicians and spiritual aristocrats of the bourgeoisie. Aren't these "all-round developed" capitalist roaders in the social-imperialist country, who have both "internal cultivation" and "external cultivation" still riding roughshod over the labouring people? What kind of a "straight line" is this? This is a "line" which creates class differentiation for the restoration of capitalism! What kind of "all-round development" is this? This is an out-and-out "all-round evolution" of capitalism! The proletariat's revolution in education is to cut down this counter-revolutionary line in education and smash the "peaceful evolution" of the bourgeoisie. We should act according to Chairman Mao's instruction and take the road of the Shanghai Machine Tools Plant to cultivate workers with both social consciousness and culture, to train them to be like the communist new man Chin Hsun-hua who is a model for revolutionary youth.

Didn't Kairov repeat and repeat that choosing some kind of "stimulus" to "stimulate" both teachers and students is "necessary in studying many questions in education"? (29) The "stimulus" that he had in mind for students was using past "famous" or "outstanding" representatives of the exploiting classes as their "stimulus" in pursuing fame and fortune and climbing to the high position of spiritual aristocrats of the bourgeoisie. For teachers, he used the saying that "teachers are the personification of all things beautiful and examples to be followed" (30) to "stimulate" their initiative to train bourgeois aristocrats, to bind them tightly to the house of the dead that is the bourgeois system of education and to make them reject ideological remoulding. Liu shao-chi, Lu Ting-yi and their gang used this "art of stimulating" to the full. They recruited bourgeois reactionary "authorities" on education and bourgeois intellectuals to corrupt a number of young teachers and students to provide organizational guarantee for pushing their counter-revolutionary revisionist line in education and their political line. The magnificent victory of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution proclaimed the complete bankruptcy of this "art" of Kairov's in the eyes of the mass of revolutionary intellectuals.

In the current movement of the proletariat's revolution in education, revolutionary teachers and revolutionary students must repudiate the exploiting classes' reactionary "art of stimulating." They should "fight self, criticize revisionism." In accordance with the outlook of the working class, they should remould themselves into fighters who "fear neither hardship nor death," fighters in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, fighters who battle all their lives for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and for the prevention of the restoration of capitalism.

Historical Experience That Merits Attention

Kairov's trump card was: I am an opponent of the bourgeois school of "modern education." Indeed, as a self-styled inheritor of the bourgeois school of "traditional education," Kairov certainly superficially "opposed" Dewey a representative of the bourgeois school of "modern education" and a scholar serving the interests of the U S imperialists. However, whether it is "giving knowledge" as emphasized by the "traditional education" school, or "training skill" as emphasized by the "modern education" school, it all reflected the dispute within the ranks of the bourgeoisie. In the final analysis, both serve training successors to the bourgeoisie, preserving capitalism and restoring capitalism. In fact, following the spread of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in the world, all reactionary schools of education to be found among the bourgeoisie are joining hands to cope with the proletariat.

After a careful look at them, people can see there is no real difference between Kairov's so-called thesis of seeds of knowledge in children (31) and his thesis that education means "organizing children's life" (32) and Dewey's pragmatic education involving the doctrine of the children being the centre and education is life. Lu Ting-yi let the cat out of the bag by declaring: The "merits" of Kairov's PEDAGOGY "lie in the fact that it replaces Dewey's." It is just because of this that the handful of Dewey's disciples in China under the cloak of Liu Shao-chi's counter-revolutionary revisionist line in education, all became "experts" on Kairov's PEDAGOGY overnight. Some of them occupied leading positions in the departments of education, while others were scattered all over the country to do their dirty work and swindle people. What a thought provoking phenomenon of class struggle is this!

What is worth particular attention is that since Dewey's pragmatic education had long lost its function of of deceiving progressive American youth, Kennedy, chief-tain of U S imperialism at that time, rushed in with the outstanding criterion of seeking knowledge in the early 60s, officially seeking help from "traditional education." Under the cover of the so-called "strengthening the link between school and life": Kairov and his kind in this same period went a step further towards Dewey's pragmatic education. No wonder Western bourgeois papers said that these two schools "are intermingling" and "are marching along the same track." Revisionism is sure to form a reactionary alliance, politically as well as ideologically and culturally, with imperialism in the end.

Kairov's so-called "system" is absurd, but the problem we see from viewing this "system" is serious: After the proletariat has gained political power, how the bourgeoisie stages a counter-seizure of power from the proletariat through the fields of education and culture in order to suppress and rule over the proletariat again.. This historical experience of the struggle between the bourgeoisie who fights for the restoration and the proletariat who fights against restoration merits our serious attention.

Through the magnificent Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in the last three years, led by the proletarian headquarters with Chairman Mao as its leader and Vice-Chairman Lin as its deputy leader, we used Mao Tsetung Thought, the powerful weapon, to overthrow the renegade, hidden traitor and scab Liu Shao-chi and his agents in the field of education. In the stage of struggle-criticism-transformation during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao put forward the timely programmatic instruction: "It is essential to shorten the length of schooling, revolutionize education, put proletarian politics in command and take the road of the Shanghai Machine Tools Plant in training technicians from among the workers and peasants with practical experience, and they should return to production after a few years' study." Inspired by this brilliant instruction of Chairman Mao's an upsurge in the proletariat's revolution in education has taken shape all over China. An educational system which serves proletarian politics and is closely linked with practice in the three great revolutionary struggles, and a teachers' contingent determined to bring about the proletariat's revolution in education are gradually being

formed. However, class struggle on the educational front still goes on, and the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie to win over the youth goes on. We have to be soberly aware that there is still a lot of work to be done concerning undertaking revolutionary mass criticism on the educational front. Only by deeply criticizing the bourgeois world outlook can we make a thoroughgoing transformation of the old educational system, teaching principles and teaching methods, and solidly set up a new educational system of the proletariat on the basis of Mao-Tsetung Thought. Let us hold the great red banner of Mao Tsetung Thought still higher and welcome the coming of a new high tide in the proletarian revolution in education!

by the Shanghai Revolutionary Mass
Criticism Writing Group

Peking Review, No. 10

March 6, 1970



NOTES

¹ There are two Chinese editions of Kairov's *Pedagogy* — one translated from the 1948 Moscow Russian edition, the other from the 1956 Moscow Russian edition. In the following they are referred to simply as the old edition and the new edition.

^{2,3} Old edition, p. 18.

^{4,5} New edition, p. 1 and p. 23.

^{6,7} Old edition, p. 11 and p. 103.

⁸ "Academician Kairov on the Guiding Principle of the Newly Compiled *Pedagogy* and the Problem of All-Round Development."

⁹ Old edition, p. 21.

^{10,11,12} Old edition, p. 60 and p. 96.

^{13,14} New edition, p. 131 and p. 132.

^{15,16} Old edition, p. 131 and p. 61.

¹⁷ New edition, p. 150-51.

¹⁸ Old edition, p. 99.

¹⁹ Kairov's report to All-Russian Congress of Teachers (July 1960).

²⁰ New edition, p. 148.

^{21,22} Old edition, p. 209 and p. 248.

²³ Old edition, p. 56.

²⁴ New edition, p. 224.

²⁵ New edition, p. 314 and p. 21.

²⁶ Old edition, p. 302.

^{27,28} New edition, p. 223 and p. 315.

²⁹ New edition, p. 308 and p. 16.

³⁰ New edition, p. 47.

³¹ Old edition, p. 16.

³² Kairov: "On the Problem of Improving and Raising the Quality of Education in Common Schools in the Soviet Union."



FAR EAST REPORTER

Annual Subscription \$2.00

Making available significant facts and analyses contributed by competent writers of the Far East.

MAUD RUSSELL, Publisher P.O. Box 1536, New York, N.Y. 10017

July 1970

SOME FAR EAST REPORTER ISSUES

Some Current Light on the NATIONALIST STRUGGLE in the PHILIPPINES	35¢
Revolution Promotes Production By Maud Russell	35¢
Chinese Women: Liberated By Maud Russell	50¢
Mao Tsetung Thought on the Financial and Monetary Front	30¢
The Struggle Between Two Lines: Mao Tsetung's Revealing 1949 Report	35¢
The Sino-Soviet Ussuri River Border Clash: The Historical Background & Current Implications By Maud Russell	40¢
United States Neo-Colonialism: Grave Digger in Asia By Maud Russell	35¢
The Rising National Liberation Struggles of the Peoples in A Key Area of Southeast Asia By Maud Russell	35¢
China's Socialism? or India's Neo-Colonialism? By Curtis Ullerich and Maud Russell	35¢
The Past in China's Present By Joseph Needham	60¢
<u>Issues on China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution</u>	
Lin Piao's Report April 1969	50¢
China's Ongoing Cultural Revolution By Maud Russell	35¢
China's Economic Health and the G P C R By Maud Russell	40¢
The Cultural Revolution in a Commune Village By Elsie Fairfax Cholmeley	25¢
Seizure of Power in China's Socialist Society By Israel Epstein	35¢
China's Genuine Democracy: Among the Communes of Mao Tien By Rewi Alley	30¢
Mass Democracy in China By Israel Epstein	
Some Background on the G P C R By Maud Russell	50¢
The Making of New Man By Tuan Ping-li	30¢
The Influence of the Thought of Mao Tsetung By Rewi Alley	25¢